

immense audience at
Greenan's Court to Wat
the Attorneys for Schn
et and Go into Argume
nce—Mr. Lodge Outlin
Keepers' Defense—Progr
the case of the State again
the brewer, for violatio

As Immense Audience to
Neenan's Court to Watch
The Attorneys for Schnitz
Act and Go Into Argument
Once—Mr. Lodge Outlines
Keepers' Defense—Program
The case of the State against
der, the brewer, for violation

law, came up before Judge A. J. the Court of Criminal Correction at 1:30 o'clock. Long set for the trial of the case was called it was p The space within the bar was jury seats, doorways and o with lawyers, saloon

The attorneys for the State v. Attorney J. B. Claiborne, Jr. and Henry T. Kent, and for McGinnis and Joseph G. Lodant, Mr. Schnalder, occupied the attorneys.

The defense waived the right

The first witness placed on Peter P. Daily of the Co. Prosecuting Attorney Claiborne to a question of Mr. Joseph Schnalder was the one the State intended to prove by the evidence mentioned in the

Sergt. Ryan was placed on the stand. Mr. Claiborne was again asked to prove by the witness that he wanted to show that the defendant was in the garden on the day named in the complaint, June 26, 1887.

Mr. Claiborne said the State
there. They had shown the
ant, Joseph Schnaidler,
proprietor of a certain beer ga
and that on the 26th day of J
cants had been sold there cou
Mr. Lodge of counsel for t
arose and stated that as the li
the case was brought was a St
posed the Court would take up
of 1887.

The court replied in the affirmative. Mr. Lodge then said he would execute the ordinance 4137, an ordinance for the taking of the sense of the city of St. Louis on the question of the sale of liquors and rum on Sunday. He would also execute the Mayor's proclamation that ordinance calling for a referendum on April 5, 1888. He would also execute the certificate of Nicholas Berryman, Mayor of St. Louis, on the vote taken at the election of the Mayor of St. Louis on April 5, 1888.

Mr. Kent asked to be shown and then both he and Judge, on behalf of the State objected that it was only a certificate taken at the general election. The point could be argued late in the case. The State Ordinance of 1869 and especially of 1871 and 1872 and 12 of 1861 was offered in evidence and the State Lodge, upon which the defense

In rebuttal Recorder D. O. called by the State and referred to the election of April 1858 in relation of refreshments was such people. Witness read the question showing 5,051 in favor of the sale of refreshments, and 7,085 votes. At that election Mayor, Comptroller and others were elected.

The vote for Mayor was 13,031

The prosecution then offered the revised ordinances of 1866, titled an ordinance concerning the approved September 3, 1866, revised ordinance of 1866, paragraph concerning misdeameanor 482, calling attention to 17 inclusive on pages 54, also article 2 of ordinance 54 volume; also the revised ordinance calling attention to the ordinance concerning ordinance 5421.

The attorneys then at 2:15 began upon the objections, the defense closing, the attorneys speaking alternately.

THE SALOON-KEEPER'S DEFENSE

The defense as outlined by Mr. [unclear] following order and upon the brief are these:

1. The law of 1837 and that passed under authority were in force until June of the

and have never been usage of the city, the opinions city councilors, the rulings of the action of the Legislature its attempted repeal acknowledged.

2. The repeal of the law of simply the enabling act, does ordinances passed under that than the removal of a scaffold completion of a building does a building.

4. There can be no prosecution of the old Sunday law, as the law and giving the people the right to see on Sunday repealed that Sunday recent repealing act applying 1857 did not reenact the Sunday

It is probable that the argument most of the afternoon Noonan will reserve his decision of days at least.

WILL ISSUE NO MORE

Warrants Refused for the Six
Arrested on Sunday

When the police applied for a morning against the saloon-keeper for violating the Sunday law, Assistant Attorney Dierkes refused, stating that he thought it useless to get more warrants in these cases unless decided by Judge Noonan. When he learned of Mr. Dierkes' marked that it was the hint of a

"What will the police do about
he was asked.
"We will continue making
orders from the Board are t
arrests, and I shall continue t
otherwise instructed."

"Ob, yes, I can issue warrants any time within a year."

"Do you base your action on the saving expenses by not issuing it present?"

"Yes; and the whole proceeds

"But suppose Judge Noonan
the cases in such a form that an
taken even if he declares that
would the warrants issue?"

"Certainly. In that case I w
the warrants for which applica
"If the law should not be decl
would it not be encouraging said
violate it if warrants are re
them?"

"Oh, I suppose the law will

few days, at least I hope so. If I issue the warrants before Sunday, the police officers to keep them."

"Did you refuse these warrants of Prosecuting Attorney C.?"

"No, it was my own free act, though it is the proper action to take in consultation with him."

MR. CLAIRBORNE
was asked what he knew about

HOT-WEATHER CLOTHES!

no oil per gross. \$1.00. Druggists.
R. G. Wanda, Jersey City, N. J.

discovery was only a quar-
ters, committed suicide by
a the street this morning.
murder is still a mystery.

MR. CLAIRBORNE
was asked what he knew about the matter.

1

and California. Ex. 1-6:30 pm 1-6:45 am

